

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated February 28, 2007 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 1-7 and 18-27 remain pending in the application after entry of the instant new claims. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 21-27 have been added. Claims 9 and 10 have been canceled. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

The Applicant acknowledges the allowance of claims 18-20, and the indication of allowable subject matter of claims 9 and 10.

The Applicant has amended the subject matter of now canceled dependent claim 9 to independent claim 1. As such, independent claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

No subject matter was amended to dependent claim 7. Claim 7 was only amended to enhance the clarity of the claim.

New claim 21 includes only the subject matter of claim 1 (without the current amendment) combined with the subject matter from now canceled claim 10. New claims 22-27 respectively correspond to claims 2-7. As such, no new matter has been added. Furthermore, independent claim 21, and the claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-7 and notification that claims 1-7 and 18-27 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicant has claimed uniquely distinct features in the instant application which are not found or suggested in the prior art. It is respectfully submitted that the language of the claims speaks for itself in defining the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the Applicant's claimed subject matter, nor what portions of the claims are specifically not taught or suggested by the prior art. The pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification" in accordance with MPEP § 2111.

Furthermore, the Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterization of the prior art, including what prior art is applicable and what the prior art teaches or suggests. The Examiner's characterizations of the art of record should not have the effect of limiting the breadth of coverage afforded the Applicant's allowed claims.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (GUID.027US01) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC  
8009 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Suite 125  
Minneapolis, MN 55425  
952.854.2700

Date: April 27, 2007

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul Sherburne", written over a horizontal line.

Paul Sherburne  
Reg. No. 57,843